

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2993

many Members of Congress and by persons throughout the country. In every administration it is an easy target. President Johnson too has been criticized by those who disagree with his foreign policy actions. Today, as a Senator I warmly commend the decision by President Johnson, to curtail our aid to five countries that trade with Cuba. This is an honorable, sensible, peaceful action which can ultimately have a significant effect on Castro.

It is true that France and Britain have announced that they will continue to trade with Cuba, in spite of the President's decision; and it is also true that the U.S. funds which will be curtailed as a result of this action are relatively modest, and involve in the case of Yugoslavia, only the financing of spare parts, a program which also is relatively small in dollar amount.

But the big fact is that the President of the United States now has gone on record as being determined to act, under the law, not to permit U.S. aid to continue to go to countries which trade with Cuba.

This action puts those countries on notice that if they continue to trade with Cuba, they cannot in the future expect to continue to receive the U.S. taxpayers' dollars which they have received in the recent past.

Mr. President, recently I have talked with many persons—both Democrats and Republicans, both workers and businessmen in Wisconsin. I found among them a remarkable consensus of opinion in opposition to trade with Castro by any of our allies or any countries friendly to us. The American people generally recognize that Castro represents a subversive, Communist threat to all the countries of Latin America, as well as a potential military danger to us. Therefore, Mr. President, we should do what we can to eradicate this cancer of communism from the Western Hemisphere. One of the obvious ways is to end the flow of our assistance to countries which would trade with this enemy. This is a peaceful, moderate, sensible course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee; the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

U.S. POLICIES ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I refer to this morning's news reports which indicate that Secretary of Defense McNamara has made it clear that the United States still hopes to bring about a major withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam by the end of 1965. One can only hope that the hope will be realized.

Mr. McNamara's view is completely consonant with the fact that our effort from the outset in Vietnam has been to supplement the efforts of the Vietnamese themselves; the conflict has been and remains primarily a Vietnamese conflict. We have not—and properly—regarded it as an American conflict to be won primarily with the expenditure of American lives and resources. There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interests which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives not only in South Vietnam but, by extension, in North Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Laos, if not, indeed, in China itself. To be sure, circumstances may change, circumstances may compel us to face that contingency. But one can only hope that they will not arise, that instead the conflict will be confined to and resolved in Vietnam alone, that the expectation of the Secretary to the effect that we will be able to withdraw the bulk of our forces by the end of 1965 will be realized.

Those forces are in Vietnam at present for only one reason—to help to improve the efficacy of the Vietnamese military. And we have got to face the fact that while this is a significant element in the situation, it is not now and has not been the major factor in the Vietnamese problem. The core of that problem has been the restoration of peace in Vietnam, not in a militarily induced vacuum, but in the context of a popularly acceptable government in Saigon able to face with assurance the government in Hanoi.

That was the hope which originally underlay our support of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, a hope which had become very slim by last summer. It was the hope of many at the time of the first military coup although some of us, myself included, had grave misgivings and had deplored the tragic assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem. For, whatever his faults and inadequacies may have been, Mr. Diem was a man of dedication in the cause of Vietnamese nationalism and his death severed the cord of civilian political continuity on which the hope for peace and an acceptable stability for so long had rested.

What is the hope now? What is the hope which derives from the second coup? Press reports indicate a popular indifference to the recent developments in Saigon. Very likely the same is true of the rest of South Vietnam. Does this coup mean that the people of that nation will be brought closer to the day when peace shall prevail? Is it likely to be the forerunner of a civilian government responsive to the needs and wishes of the Vietnamese people in the south and enjoying their acceptance and sup-

port? Or does it mean, simply, that the cards of military power in Vietnam have been reshuffled? Does it mean, merely, that military coup begets military coup and the second is but a precursor of the third? How many will it take before these changes will have become totally irrelevant to the life of the Vietnamese people? Until their only significance shall be in terms of who shall receive our aid and wield the power which it represents in Vietnam?

These are questions, Mr. President, which we cannot and must not evade any longer. An embarrassed silence will no longer suffice in the light of the indicated course of developments. There is not a sufficient margin of time to ignore these questions for very much longer. And it is not enough of an answer that the new junta proclaims its anticommunism and anti-neutralism. These words may set well with us. They may be music to our ears, but they are by now an old tune, played with minor variations in many parts of the world wherever American aid is sought or extended. The important question remains: What does this coup mean to the people of Vietnam and to the solution of their grave and agonizing problems?

That is a key question because the conflict in Vietnam remains a Vietnamese conflict, and in the end it must be resolved by the Vietnamese themselves. We have given extraordinary support to two successive governments in Vietnam. We can do no more and should try to do no more for a third. We have teetered for too long on the brink of turning the war in Vietnam which is still a Vietnamese war into an American war to be paid for primarily with American lives. There is no national interest at this time, as I have already suggested, which would appear to justify this conversion. Certainly, the second coup in Vietnam cannot conceivably justify the issuance of a new blank check on our aid funds and on the lives of American servicemen.

Secretary of Defense McNamara put it well when he said: "This is a Vietnamese war, and in the final analysis, it must be fought and won by the Vietnamese."

If anything, the words apply with even greater emphasis in view of the second military upheaval.

It seems to me that the President of the United States has acted most appropriately, therefore, in making clear that our desire to help the Vietnamese to find a way to stability and peace remains. But it is also clear that it remains to be seen whether the latest coup will really lead in that direction.

And may I say, too, that it seems to me that President de Gaulle has done well to speak out on southeast Asia. He has again demonstrated a sense of history and statesmanship in seeking new ways for dealing with the continuing instability and insecurity which prevails in Vietnam and much of southeast Asia. President Johnson, in pointing to the differences of view between ourselves and France, most appropriately noted in comment on President de Gaulle's remarks that, "If we could have neutralization of both North Vietnam and South

MORI/CDF

Vietnam, I am sure that would be considered sympathetically." The President was, in my opinion—and today I am speaking only personally—referring to true neutralization—a status based on guarantees and not on words or promises or continued infiltration from the north.

The possibilities of such a neutralization may be extremely difficult to realize, but they ought not to be dismissed out of hand. There are the possibilities of the international patrol and control of borders in which U.S. forces in Vietnam and those of other nations prepared to do so could make a significant contribution. Indeed, Cambodia has indicated that it would welcome and do everything possible to accommodate such an international patrol. And it would seem to me that the Government of Laos under Prince Souvanna Phouma would have much to gain from a similar arrangement and, indeed, so would Thailand.

In that kind of a situation, there would most certainly be a role for France. We may or may not agree with President De Gaulle's approach in whole or part. That is our right and responsibility, even as the French have the right and responsibility to speak and act as they see fit even though I thoroughly disagree with De Gaulle's recognition of Communist China and, along with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and others, consider it a tragic mistake.

But whatever our differences, it seems to me most glib to make light of the admittedly unsatisfactory situation in Laos or the unhappy state of our relations with Cambodia as a basis for any offhand rejection of De Gaulle's essay at a new approach to Indochina and southeast Asia. Indeed, we might well ask ourselves: Do we ourselves, in terms of our national interests as seen in juxtaposition to the cost in American lives and resources, prefer what exists in South Vietnam to what exists in Laos or in Cambodia? Do we prefer another Vietnamese type of American involvement or perhaps a Korean-type involvement in these other countries and elsewhere in southeast Asia? Are we eager for expenditure of the great additions of foreign aid which they would entail? Are we to regard lightly the American casualties which would certainly be involved?

These questions, Mr. President, are very much to the point of the serious situation in southeast Asia, particularly in the Indochinese region, and of President de Gaulle's approach to it. If we face these questions fully and in all candor, if we do not seek to achieve lightly with words what can only be accomplished with blood and other sacrifices on the part of the people of this Nation, it seems to me that we will welcome a contribution of thought and effort from France to the possible solution of the problems of that troubled region. We will not deplore, ridicule, discourage, or denounce a French contribution. Rather, we will hope that, in spite of our doubts and certain of our experiences, the contributions will prove constructive, and we will do whatever we are able to do to bring the hope to fruition.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1964

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, marked the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, a holiday celebrated by people of Lithuanian descent throughout the free world, and honored by people everywhere who are dedicated to the establishment and maintenance of democratic ideals.

All persons who are subjects of tyranny and oppression can take courage from the example which the Lithuanian people have set throughout history. Though the challenge to liberty has been strong and though the yoke of oppression has often been heavy, especially in recent years, the determination of the Lithuanian people to maintain their ideals has remained firm. They have never forsaken their belief in the dignity of man and have fought a valiant struggle for human freedom against the forces of tyranny.

During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians established a powerful independent state in Europe and from the 14th to the 18th century they enjoyed political supremacy over much of Europe between the Baltic and Black Seas. The citizens lived in peace and safety and enjoyed many human freedoms denied to the citizens of neighboring states.

In 1795 Lithuania was annexed to Russia, thus losing her cherished freedom. From that date until 1918 czarist Russia cruelly repressed every uprising and revolt, but the oppressors could not extinguish the deep-rooted nationalism of the Lithuanian people.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians realized their national dream and again became an independent Republic. They enjoyed 22 years of freedom during which time they made many advances in their domestic economic, social, and political development. Catastrophe came again, however, on June 14, 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded the Republic of Lithuania and declared it a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet claim to the valiant and freedom-loving country of Lithuania. As a nation we are convinced that the spirit to resist tyranny which is in the hearts of all Lithuanians will emerge triumphant over their Soviet oppressors.

I am proud that many Lithuanians of American descent are citizens of Massachusetts. Their contributions have enriched our State and our country as a whole, and their love of liberty has been an inspiration to all of us. I join with Lithuanians everywhere in honoring an anniversary of national independence which is particularly significant to all peoples who must continue to wage the war against tyranny.

THIS COUNTRY NEEDS GI BILL TO COMPLEMENT COLD WAR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the June 1963 edition of Selective Service, which is the internal newspaper of the Selective Service System, states that the 12,000 servicemen who are disabled

each year are presently eligible to receive vocational rehabilitation which was formerly unavailable for cold war veterans. The extension of this readjustment benefit was made possible by an amendment which I offered to Senate bill 2697 during the 87th Congress. The Congress of the United States should be justly proud of having extended the benefits of vocational rehabilitation to those cold war veterans who have been disabled while serving their country.

But these 12,000 are only a small fraction of the half a million servicemen who return to civilian life each year. All of these men who have helped to protect their Nation and the entire free world from the forces of tyranny and aggression have been subject not only to the dangers of physical disability but also the danger that they will be at a disadvantage in competing for scarce jobs when they return to civilian life. This would not be the case if all of our young men served in the Armed Forces since all would be on an equal footing. But at the present time only 45 percent of those eligible for the draft actually see substantial military service. This means that while these men are serving their country for 2, 3, 4, or more years, the other 55 percent are able to gain valuable experience and education which gives them a distinct advantage in competing for scarce positions during this time of relatively high unemployment.

It is only just that this Nation should aid these fine young men who have served their country during the cold war to continue their education. At present, readjustment assistance is limited to the 12,000 cold war servicemen who receive at least a 30 percent disability each year, and then the aid is limited to restoring the degree of employability which they possessed prior to their enlistment. The United States is in the anomalous position of requiring that a serviceman receive a serious injury before we will render readjustment assistance to him, and we have limited this assistance to vocational training while refusing to assist him in obtaining a higher education despite this country's urgent need for additional thousands of scientific, medical, and educational personnel.

I urge the Senate to pass the cold war GI bill which will extend education, training, and home-farm loan benefits to the 500,000 cold war veterans who return to civilian life annually. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Selective Service be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DISABLED VETERANS OF PEACETIME SERVICE ELIGIBLE FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Nearly 100,000 peacetime veterans who have suffered service-connected disabilities will benefit under terms of the peacetime vocational rehabilitation bill signed into law by President Kennedy, the Veterans' Administration points out.

This bill extends to these peacetime veterans the benefits of VA's wartime vocational rehabilitation bill.

The Veterans' Administration reports that some 12,000 peacetime veterans incur injuries